Minutes of the 23-24 April 2003 meeting of the Oregon Coast TRT SubPanel, Corvallis, Oregon

Attendance. *TRT Members:* Tom Nickelson, Chuck Huntington, Pete Lawson, Tom Wainwright; *Staff:* Heather Stout, Rosemary Furfey, Bridgette Lohrman; *Invited guests:* Gordie Reeves (USFS, Forest Sciences Lab), Kelly Burnett (USFS FSL), Mike Ford (NMFS NWFSC), David Teel (NMFS NWFSC), Michael Banks (OSU COMES), Lisa Borgerson (ODFW), Leslie Schaefer (NMFS NWR).

The meeting convened at 10:30 am.

1. **Introductions.** All members, staff, and guests were introduced.

2. **Review of Minutes (Stout).** Minutes of the 25 February meeting were approved and will be posted on the NWFSC website.

3. **Public Outreach (Furfey, Lohrman, Stout).** Four items are being worked on:

   a) Rosemary has prepared a draft "interested parties" letter about the recovery process for Oregon coastal coho salmon. Panel members suggested several changes. It was noted that we need to settle the official name of the combined Oregon coast and SONCC TRT.

   b) Bridgette has prepared a draft survey of watershed council information needs, with cooperation from NMFS, OSU Extension, and the OSU survey planning center. Goals are (1) outreach, (2) identifying resources used by watershed council coordinators, and (3) identifying the best means of communicating with watershed councils. Panel members will return comments to Bridgette by May 15th.

4. **NMFS 4(d) database (Schaeffer).** Leslie Schaeffer described the NMFS "4(d)" database developed cooperatively by NMFS NWR Protected Resources Division, ODFW, and OWEB. The database covers all research and monitoring activities for threatened salmon conducted under ESA section 4(d) rules in the Northwest Region. The database includes both permit applications and results (number of fish handled, types of observations conducted, etc.--not scientific results). Any recent activity covered by a 4(d) rule or requiring a state Scientific Take Permit (STP) should be in the database. Projects permitted under section 10 are not in the database unless they require a STP; habitat projects are not included unless they involve handling fish. The database can be accessed via a web interface or directly via MS Access. The web interface requires a guest user login, and allows selection of data by a number of criteria including year, state, basin (4th field HUC), species. TRT members are encouraged to try the web application, and send comments to Leslie.

5. **Biological Review Team Update (Lawson, Wainwright).** Following the January BRT meeting that reviewed all listed Pacific salmon ESUs, a draft report was sent to co-managers for their review. These comments have been received, and the BRT met to update recommendations on ESUs that had substantial comments or new information. A draft final report is being prepared, and should go to the NMFS regional offices in early May. The report will be published as a NOAA Technical Memorandum. Any proposed changes in status are expected to be made this fall, following publication of a revised hatchery policy.

6. **Genetic analysis (Ford, Teel).** Mike Ford and David Teel distributed and discussed a preliminary report analyzing micro-satellite DNA from Oregon coast coho salmon scale samples. The framework for this pilot study was Nickelson's 2001 population complex designations. The study focused on comparing these complexes and looking at within-complex variation. There was a special focus on comparing lake and river populations. The discussion focused on a dendrogram illustrating the degree of separation among sampled populations. The dendrogram was described as a "bushy tree" with lots of temporal and local geographic variation, and fairly small separation among large clusters. Still, 4 major clusters are apparent: lake populations, Coos-Coquille, Umpqua, and north-central coast. A "scenario analysis" assessing different hierarchical models for population clustering was also discussed. General conclusions were:

   a) Lake populations show a clear, cohesive structure.

   b) Other clusters are not as well separated.

   c) Model results support Nickelson's population complexes as independent units, but smaller subunits may also be independent. In particular, there is evidence of local genetic structure within the Umpqua Basin.

   d) The results should not be interpreted as reason for lumping populations that don't show differences; the study does not provide such "negative" evidence. However, there may be some evidence for splitting populations.

   Future plans include obtaining more years of data for some populations. This would allow brood-cycle comparisons that could improve estimates of effective population size.

7. **Task Reports**

   a) **CLAMS/GIS (Lawson, Reeves, Burnett)--**The CLAMS project is able to provide some GIS support for the TRT process. Initially, we will focus on providing support for about one month of technician salary to develop cartographic products for the population identification report, with later support for developing analytic products in support of recovery planning.

   b) **Kostow populations mapping (Huntington)--**Chuck Huntington presented a map of the "Kostow" populations identified in the ODFW 1995 wild fish report, along with a table comparing the population scale with that of 4th, 5th, and 6th field HUCs. These populations were identified through an interactive process with ODFW district biologists. Some inconsistencies in population definitions were noted—in particular that north coast populations were split on a finer scale than the south coast populations. Another problem noted was that some of the "populations" identified have no coho salmon in the basin, while some streams with coho salmon were not part of any population. Tom Nickelson presented a table of all the coastal basins including stream miles and coho habitat miles for comparison with the "Kostow" populations.

   c) **Correlations in Population Abundance (Wainwright)--**Postponed to Thursday work session.

8. **Administrative Issues.** It is clear that a larger room is needed for future meetings. The conference rooms at the Forest Sciences Laboratory and the ODFW office at Adair were suggested. Gordie will reserve a room at FSL for the 10 June and 23 July meetings. A special work session on population identification will be held 21 May at the ODFW research station in Corvallis, to prepare a draft proposal for the 10 June meeting.

9. **Tasks.** Heather, Rosemary, and Bridgette will continue working on the public presentation, a poster for HMSCFest in June, and an introductory letter to interested parties.

10. **Announcement.** Tom Nickelson announced that ODFW is starting work on a coastal coho recovery plan, to be completed in 8 months.

11. **Public comment.** No members of the public were present.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Work session, Thursday 24 April. A half-day work session was held to begin developing a proposal for population structure for the ESU. Attendees were Lawson, Furfey, Nickelson, Reeves, Stout, and Wainwright. Topics discussed included spatial patterns in temporal correlations among spawner survey segments, geographic patterns of spawn timing, VSP population identification criteria, historical importance of lowland portions of basins for coho salmon production, relationship of populations in large river basins to those in small coastal tributaries, practical issues (scales appropriate for monitoring, clarity of approach to lay reviewers, lack of data on migration rates), and biogeographic regions and diversity. No proposal was developed, but it was suggested that each panel member will develop their own proposal to be discussed at the May work session.